

proper place—that every thing in relation to it is well understood and duly appreciated. Can you join in any expressions of this kind? Surely you cannot; for you know too well what was done on that frontier, and how much immediately around Sandusky, that has never come to light. If my services have been duly appreciated, then truly have I been resting too contentedly upon what I have done; for no public expression, conveying an assurance of the grateful sense in which my services are held, has ever yet reached me. You may say that I received a sword from the ladies of Chillicothe, and that I was also breveted by the President: for the first I feel as a soldier ought to feel for a gift which he should prize as his life; as for the latter, I regard it as a thing of no value, and not to be considered, for brevets had been dealt out by the dozen, and often times to those who had never seen an enemy. My name was once before Congress for a vote of thanks, and it was rejected as unworthy an expression of its approbation. When I was thus so flatteringly passed upon, was Congress, in your opinion, informed of all that I had done in the Northwest? You will say that it was not. And when, at a very recent period, too, I was compelled by my necessities to ask a place, and an unimportant one, and found difficulties and vexations when I had expected every thing the reverse, had I not a right to believe that my claims to preference were considered but of the same rank with those of every other applicant for office? The world knows that there was a repulse of the enemy at Lower Sandusky, but what further does it know calculated to enhance it above the most trivial affairs of the war? Does it know that I disobeyed your orders to abandon the place, and that this disobedience saved your army from a precipitate retreat, and perhaps the whole frontier from the incursions of a savage foe? A council of your general and field officers decided upon the propriety of falling back upon Upper Sandusky; every arrangement was made for a precipitate retreat, and the signal of departure was to be given at the moment of my joining. I care not. Your order was disobeyed, and you were thus saved from the of a retrograde step. The consequences of the repulse of the enemy at Lower Sandusky were, as you have long known, more important than can be conceived by any one unacquainted with the topography of the section of country under view, and the position of the opposing forces. How you would have fared had I been captured, you can best conjecture; at all events, it did appear that, at the time, you believed the enemy more than a match for you. And what would have been the consequences of your defeat? A smoking frontier of more than five hundred miles in extent. What saved the boats and the immense stores concentrated at Cleveland under the direction of Major, now General Jessup? What also prevented a combined attack of land and naval forces upon the fleet of Commodore Perry at Erie, at a time when its destruction must have been certain? My disobedience of your orders—my subsequent defeat and repulse of the enemy at Sandusky. Gen. Proctor, on leaving Detroit in July, 1813, had no other object in view than the destruction of the fleet of Commodore Perry at Erie, and of the military stores and boats at Cleveland. He blockaded Fort Meigs merely as a cover to his real intentions, and to afford him an opportunity of ascertaining what reinforcements were marching out, that he might be assured of the safety of Detroit during his absence. Satisfied of this, he left Fort Meigs with a force of at least 3,000 men (Indians included) in furtherance of the grand objects of the expedition. On reaching the point of crossing, at the entrance of Sandusky bar, his Indian force refused to go further on the lake, without first taking the scalps and plunder at Fort Sandusky. General Proctor, from his own written statement, (now in your hands,) unwillingly indulged them. An attack was made—it failed—and with heavy loss. The Indians deserted to a man, and thus an expedition, originally well planned, and fraught with deadly consequences to our cause, was completely defeated by a force of 150 men, of whom nothing was expected, and for whom nothing further in praise has been offered than was extracted from McAfee's History of the War in the West.

Respectfully,
G. CROGHAN.
To Gen. Wm. H. Harrison,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

NEW ORLEANS, Dec. 20, 1825.

DEAR SIR: I did not immediately answer your letter of the 24th October, because there appears no call for haste, and moreover I have been, since its receipt, occasionally unwell, and occupied more than usually in the business of my office. I willingly accede to the proposition made by you for referring the matter between us to some of our mutual friends, and will abide by their decision, provided no contradiction be given by you to the statements contained in the letters which I shall offer in evidence. I thus reserve to myself the right of a rejoinder, if it is necessary. A correct copy of our correspondence will be immediately forwarded to General Jessup, to be laid before the Board.

Respectfully yours,
G. CROGHAN.
To Gen. Wm. H. Harrison,
Washington City.

From the Ohio Statesman.

MORE OF THE BATTLE OF THE THAMES, AND MORE HISTORY CORRECTED.

The over-anxious aids and friends of Gen. Harrison, are getting him into a pretty predicament. Of all the unfortunate campaigns with which Gen. Harrison has been connected, none will redound more to his everlasting disgrace than his campaign for the Presidency in 1840. It is bringing to light facts in his military history that were heretofore shrouded in mystery, and but for this campaign, might have remained a mystery to all future ages. But the light of truth has at last broken upon the country, and nothing is left but disgrace to those who have too long already imposed upon the credulity of men by falsified history.

Col. Croghan's letters open a new era in the life of Gen. Harrison, as it dispels the mystery so long covered up by false certificates, and still more false biography. The affair of the Thames is also assuming a shape no longer to be misrepresented for the purpose of bolstering up Harrison at the expense of Col. Johnson and his brave companions.

The following correspondence places this matter in its true light. The letter of Col. Johnson, dated Dec. 23d, 1831, was written before Gen. Harrison was thought of for the Presidency—it was written as a matter of history, and has never been attempted to be contradicted,—it more than sustains his Chillicothe speech, at which Mr. Carnes seemed to take exception, but from which exceptions he and his General backed out very hastily, when Col. Johnson asked them upon what part of it they made issue. The truth is, Harrison is most emphatically used up by the heroes of the Thames and of Fort Stephenson; and after reading these facts as adduced by these two brave officers—and none braver ever lived—we can all account for Harrison's resigning in the midst of the war. What have Harrison's friends to say now? Has he any political opinions for the public eye? His military character will not bear him through. He has lived too long already on private eye reputation!

CINCINNATI, Aug. 25, 1840.

DEAR COL.—As there are several very different accounts recently given, of the battle of the Thames, I am induced to ask you for a written statement of the circumstances of that battle, as I am sure that no man will doubt the truth of your statement.

Will you be so good as to state also, General Harrison's position on the ground.

W. ALLEN.

COL. R. M. JOHNSON.

CINCINNATI, Aug. 20th, 1840.

SIR: In answer to your inquiry as to the Battle of the Thames, I enclose you a letter which I wrote to Gen. Armstrong, dated Dec. 23d, 1831. In answer to your further inquiry, as to the position of Gen. Harrison, during the battle, I state that after he permitted me to charge the enemy, I did not see him till the battle was over.

Your friend,
R. M. JOHNSON.
Hon. Wm. Allen.

NEW ORLEANS, Sept. 2d, 1825.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 31st August

was received this morning. Let your exposure of the Sandusky affair be as it may, my letters of the 24th May and 5th ult. cannot be withdrawn; to do so, were to admit their statements are incorrect.—Should the publication of Dawson's supplement be satisfactory, I will of course proceed no further in the matter; in truth, will be satisfied with much less than is asked for in my letter of the 24th May; for I care not that the world should know how far I lent myself to serve the public, and to save you. My letter of the 24th May was not written for the public eye, else it had been differently worded; it was for yourself alone, and intended to operate upon your feelings of generosity, which, in relation to myself had been dormant for twelve years, greatly to my injury, and it was, therefore, that I placed before you, in the strongest language of which I was capable, those facts which seemed best calculated to operate upon the feelings I was desirous of calling into action. My letter of 8th August, which you have determined on constraining into a threat of the most offensive character, was written with no other view than the one expressed, to prove to you that I was in earnest; for I had every reason to believe that without an occasional hint of the kind, you might in your forgetfulness, let slip a third opportunity for rendering justice to those who fought at Sandusky.

Yours,
G. CROGHAN.
To Gen. Wm. H. Harrison,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

NEW ORLEANS, Dec. 20, 1825.

DEAR SIR: I did not immediately answer your letter of the 24th October, because there appears no call for haste, and moreover I have been, since its receipt, occasionally unwell, and occupied more than usually in the business of my office. I willingly accede to the proposition made by you for referring the matter between us to some of our mutual friends, and will abide by their decision, provided no contradiction be given by you to the statements contained in the letters which I shall offer in evidence. I thus reserve to myself the right of a rejoinder, if it is necessary. A correct copy of our correspondence will be immediately forwarded to General Jessup, to be laid before the Board.

Respectfully yours,
G. CROGHAN.
To Gen. Wm. H. Harrison,
Washington City.

From the Ohio Statesman.

MORE OF THE BATTLE OF THE THAMES, AND MORE HISTORY CORRECTED.

The over-anxious aids and friends of Gen. Harrison, are getting him into a pretty predicament. Of all the unfortunate campaigns with which Gen. Harrison has been connected, none will redound more to his everlasting disgrace than his campaign for the Presidency in 1840. It is bringing to light facts in his military history that were heretofore shrouded in mystery, and but for this campaign, might have remained a mystery to all future ages. But the light of truth has at last broken upon the country, and nothing is left but disgrace to those who have too long already imposed upon the credulity of men by falsified history.

Col. Croghan's letters open a new era in the life of Gen. Harrison, as it dispels the mystery so long covered up by false certificates, and still more false biography. The affair of the Thames is also assuming a shape no longer to be misrepresented for the purpose of bolstering up Harrison at the expense of Col. Johnson and his brave companions.

The following correspondence places this matter in its true light. The letter of Col. Johnson, dated Dec. 23d, 1831, was written before Gen. Harrison was thought of for the Presidency—it was written as a matter of history, and has never been attempted to be contradicted,—it more than sustains his Chillicothe speech, at which Mr. Carnes seemed to take exception, but from which exceptions he and his General backed out very hastily, when Col. Johnson asked them upon what part of it they made issue. The truth is, Harrison is most emphatically used up by the heroes of the Thames and of Fort Stephenson; and after reading these facts as adduced by these two brave officers—and none braver ever lived—we can all account for Harrison's resigning in the midst of the war. What have Harrison's friends to say now? Has he any political opinions for the public eye? His military character will not bear him through. He has lived too long already on private eye reputation!

CINCINNATI, Aug. 25, 1840.

DEAR COL.—As there are several very different accounts recently given, of the battle of the Thames, I am induced to ask you for a written statement of the circumstances of that battle, as I am sure that no man will doubt the truth of your statement.

Will you be so good as to state also, General Harrison's position on the ground.

W. ALLEN.

COL. R. M. JOHNSON.

CINCINNATI, Aug. 20th, 1840.

SIR: In answer to your inquiry as to the Battle of the Thames, I enclose you a letter which I wrote to Gen. Armstrong, dated Dec. 23d, 1831. In answer to your further inquiry, as to the position of Gen. Harrison, during the battle, I state that after he permitted me to charge the enemy, I did not see him till the battle was over.

Your friend,
R. M. JOHNSON.
Hon. Wm. Allen.

NEW ORLEANS, Sept. 2d, 1825.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 31st August

DECEMBER 23d, 1834.

DEAR SIR: I have just received your favor of the 19th containing certain inquiries as to the battle of the Thames, 5th of October, 1813, in Upper Canada.

1. The mounted regiment under my command, consisted of one thousand men at the time of the charge.

2. They were armed with muskets and rifles, and tomahawks or small hatchets, and butcher knives.

3. The British had one brass field piece, (six pounder) the same that was taken by us in the Revolutionary war at Saratoga, and retaken from us at the surrender of Detroit by General Hull. It was placed in the road near the Thames, not far from the centre of the British line.

4. The British formed two lines, resting on the Thames and running out to a swamp two or three hundred yards from the river and parallel with it.

5. I presume Proctor was stationed considerably in the rear of his troops, and probably commenced his flight the moment he saw his forces defeated and taken prisoners.

6. I think the best ground for defence was selected.

7. The militia infantry were stationed a reasonable distance in the rear of the mounted regiment, in order of battle, say from one half to one mile. My brother, Col. James Johnson, charged the British forces with the first battalion, five hundred men, and succeeded without the loss of a man—one horse killed, shot in the head—in advancing he received the fire of one line of the British, and then of the other, in close succession; the cannon was not fired; I crossed the swamp with the second battalion, (five hundred men), and fought against the Indians, supposed fourteen hundred warriors, under Tecumseh, without any aid whatever. A regiment was ordered to reinforce me at the close of the battle; but did not reach us until the battle was over, and the Indians had fled.—The official report is incorrect in saying that the hard fighting on the left was a part of Gov. Shelby's men. We had no assistance, except that a few scattering volunteers from the infantry, who might have pushed into our ranks. I was wounded and could give no information to the commanding General, and he did not know at the time he made his reports, that I had crossed the swamp with my regiment; as when he gave the order to make the charge, he thought from my information, that I could not cross the swamp; which I discovered I could do a few minutes after he left me, and believing that it was most safe, and that my regiment was sufficient, I divided my force as stated above, and the victory on both sides was complete; but, no doubt, the instantaneous capture of the British, and the early death of the Indian chief, were powerful operating causes in our favor.

I am, &c.

R. M. JOHNSON.

N. B.—It is true to truth to state, that I requested General Harrison to permit me to charge, and, knowing that I had trained my men for it during our short service, he gave the order.

THE LAST TRICK.

A most adroit species of swindling was practiced upon several clerical gentlemen last week in this city. One needs possess even more than seven senses to prove or frustrate the operations of the swindling fraternity. A young man of genteel appearance called upon the Rev. Mr. Clay, and stated to him that the only apology he could offer for intruding upon him, was that his name was exactly the same as the Reverend gentleman's—that he was unfortunate—that he had been out of a situation for a considerable time—and was without the means to return to his friends at New York, and begged the loan of three dollars from his namesake. The sympathies of the Reverend gentleman were so much wrought upon by the well-told tale of the stranger, that instead of lending him three dollars, he lent him five, to be returned as soon as he was landed at New York. The next day the Reverend gentleman had occasion to call upon an Episcopal Bishop, and was told that he was engaged. He was, however, shown into the back parlor of the Bishop's residence, and great was his surprise to hear the voice of his eleemosynary friend of the preceding day, palming off upon the credulous Bishop the same story of having the same name as the Bishop. The Reverend gentleman could contain himself no longer, but rushed into the room, and charged him with his duplicity. The tale was told to the Bishop, and the Rev. Mr. Clay went in search of a constable. The Bishop, to make assurance doubly sure, locked the door, and began to reiterate with the poor culprit upon the impropriety of such doings, when a loud knock at the door was heard, and soon after a tap at the parlor door; the door was opened by the Bishop, when a stout gentleman with a large stick in his hand, said, pointing to the culprit, "that's the rascal, let me get at him."—walked up to the young gentleman and collared him. They immediately walked to the street door, followed by the Bishop, who thought that the new comer was an officer; they no sooner, however, slipped off from the street door, than each of them put his finger to his nose significantly, and burst into a loud guffaw, exclaiming, "it's all right, old gentleman," and disappeared. The new visitor was an accomplice!

[Sat. Cour.]

BANK OF KENTUCKY.—The teller of the Bank of Kentucky has been held to bail in \$5,000, on the charges alleged against him of having appropriated the funds to his private use.

THE STANDARD.

GEORGETOWN, SEPTEMBER 10, 1840.

FOR PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

MARTIN VAN BUREN

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,

RICHARD M. JOHNSON.

OHIO ELECTORAL TICKET.

SENATORIAL ELECTORS.

BENJAMIN JONES, of Wayne county.

FRANCIS A. CUNNINGHAM, of Preble.

CONGRESSIONAL ELECTORS.

1st District, John H. Gerard,

2nd " James B. Cameron,

3d " Christopher Sroufe,

4th " Nathan Kelly,

5th " James Cole,

6th " William Skinner,

7th " John A. Fulton,

8th " George W. Sharp,

9th " Daniel Karshner,

10th " John P. Hambleton,

11th " Samuel Smith,

12th " Calvin Ackley,

13th " James Hoagland,

14th " Ephraim Wood,

15th " Joseph Lewis,

16th " John Sherman,

17th " William Deford,

18th " Matthias Sheplar,

19th " James Simeral.

OCTOBER ELECTION.

FOR GOVERNOR OF OHIO,

WILSON SHANNON.

For Congress,

WILLIAM DOAN.

For Representatives

Of the District composed of Brown, Clermont and Clinton.

DAVID G. DEVORE, of Brown County,

THOMAS J. BUCHANAN, of Clermont,

THOMAS L. CAROTHERS, of Clinton.

For Sheriff,

JOHN J. HIGGINS.

For Auditor,

JAMES J. SMITH.

For Recorder,

DAVID CRAWFORD.

For Commissioner,

SAMUEL KERR.

For Coroner,

SYLVESTER SHAW.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY.

Since the suspension of 1837, much has been learnt, in regard to the operations of banking, that promises much good to the public. Before that time, the secrets connected with the subject were revealed to but few besides stockholders, and the public regarded the occasional "breaking" of banks as a necessary evil. They viewed the failure of a bank only as a loss to those who held its notes, without considering or knowing that stockholders were often made rich by such "failures"—(a fashionable term applied to these swindling transactions.)—The people now desire that if bank paper is still to be forced upon them, the stockholders shall be made responsible for its redemption. But the federalists, who have always been in favor of exclusive privileges for the few at the expense of the many, vote against this reasonable demand of the people, both in the State and national legislatures. Their course in the legislature of Ohio last winter, was exactly in accordance with their acts in Congress, as exhibited below.

REFORMATION OF THE BANKING SYSTEM.

It is a common thing for individuals opposed to the Administration to say; "Oh, we're in favor of principles of individual responsibility, and of having Banks, and those who control them, made liable to the full rigor of the law."

No doubt this is the language of many a dishonest federal whig, who is willing to assume any appearance and profess any principle, to hold the party together and secure a portion of the spoils of office for himself;—and there is equally as little doubt, that many a conscientious and honest whig makes use of the same profession, sincerely believing them to be held and put forth, in good faith, by those who assume to be leaders in his party. To the latter class we wish to address a few words:

The language of racers must outweigh all professions. There is an old adage that "actions speak louder than words"—and what is more to the purpose, they invariably speak truth. Then let us see what is the language of actions upon this subject.

Towards the close of the last session of Congress a bill to re-charter the Banks of the District of Columbia came up in the House. These institutions were then and are now in a state of suspension, and complaints of gross fraud and oppression, attested upon oath by numerous witnesses, were made against them.

Well, the bill to re-charter these institutions being before the House, Mr. Cooper, a democrat from Georgia, moved, as an amendment, the following words:

"That the notes of the said Banks shall, at all times, be redeemable in specie; and, on failure thereof, the charters shall be forfeited."

Which amendment was agreed to—years 107—says 76—the Ohio members voting as follows:

FOR IT—Messrs. Doan, Duncan, Hastings, Leadbetter, Parrish, Starkweather, Swearingen, Taylor and Weller, 9. All Democrats.

AGAINST IT—Messrs. Mason, C.

Morris and Ridgway, 8.—All federal whigs.

DEMOCRATS ABSENT.—Medill, (engaged on Committee in New Jersey election) and Sweeney.

FEDERAL WHIGS ABSENT.—Corwin, (seeking office in Ohio.) Goods, Bond, Giddings and J. W. Allen. Of these, John W. Allen had voted a moment before, and shot the pit, on this question, to avoid voting.

Put the same question to the PEOPLE—not the corrupt federal party leaders, who are willing and ready to justify any abuse of the Banking system, because, as was said by Demetrius, the silver smith, "by this craft we have our living"—put the question to the PEOPLE, we say,—"Ought not a bank redeem its paper with specie or forfeit its charter?"—and who among you, fellow-citizens, would be found voting against it? But here were three members of Congress, who stand among the acknowledged leaders of the federal whig party, and two of them have been nominated by that party for re-election,—voting against it—aye, and voting with the bulk of their party colleagues too; while Allen, and perhaps others, are found sneaking away from their seats to avoid voting at all.

Mr. Petriken then offered the following amendment:

"Provided, That the President and directors of said banks shall be jointly and severally, in their individual capacity, liable for all notes issued or debts contracted by said banks respectively, from and after the day this act goes into effect, to be recovered as other debts of like amount may at the time be by law recoverable."

Which was carried in the affirmative—years 92 says 90. The Ohio members voting as follows:

FOR IT.—Messrs. Doan, Duncan, Hastings, Leadbetter, Parrish, Starkweather, Swearingen, Taylor and Weller, 9. All democrats.

AGAINST IT.—Messrs. John W. Allen, Mason and Ridgway, 3. All federal whigs.

Absent as above—except that Allen was caught inside the bar, and Morris shot the pit.

What do the PEOPLE—what do all honest men say to this question—"Ought not Banks to be liable for their debts, just as individuals are?" Who votes against it? When the same principle was contended for in regard to our Ohio Banks, we heard a great many men—aye, and a great many honest men, too, say that it would not do, because we could not change the charters of our banks—they were in the nature of contracts.—But here Congress was about renewing charters—making new contracts, (taking them upon that ground) and the question was whether a condition in these new contracts ought not to be that the Bankers, who expected to profit by them, should stand upon the same footing that you and I stand upon, fellow citizen, and not be allowed to shut up or break up and swindle the public with impunity.—That was the question. Who votes against it? No honest man—no true republican! And yet, there stand the names of three leading federal whig politicians from Ohio; the remaining five of the whig force in the Ohio Delegation having skulked away from their seats, to electioneer for office at home, or avoid the responsibility of voting!

We find another very important amendment proposed by Mr. Petriken as follows:

"That in case the said banks shall refuse to pay specie on demand, persons so concerned shall have remedy by judgment and execution at law, on ten days' notice, before any Justice of the peace of said District."

Which amendment was carried in the affirmative—years 88—says 70. The Ohio members voting as follows:

FOR IT.—Messrs. Doan, Duncan, Hastings, Leadbetter, Parrish, Starkweather, Swearingen, Taylor and Weller, 9. All Democrats.

AGAINST IT.—Mr. Ridgway, 1.—Federal Whig.

Absent, as above, except Allen, Mason and Morris had all three shot the pit.

Let us put this question to the PEOPLE. Suppose you owe to a banking corporation five dollars—they can go by their proper officer, before a magistrate, and get law to collect it? Suppose you hold the note of a Bank for five dollars, and go with it to the counter of the institution to get gold or silver for it. The cashier refuses to redeem it; refuses, on the part of the Bank, to pay its debt. Then, you have not as good a right to sue the bank as the bank had to sue you! Does not our Constitution say that all men are created equal—that they are endowed with equal rights—and that our courts shall be open for the Administration of justice, without denial or delay? Who then—what honest man, of whatever party; votes against the above proposition? And yet, look at the vote in Congress! Not a single federal whig member of the Ohio Delegation voting for it—and all but one member skulking away from their duty to their constituents, because they dare not vote against it.

Men and brethren—think of these things.

ELECTIONS.

MISSOURI.—We have not received the official returns of this State. It is ascertained, however, that the majority for Reynolds (the democratic candidate for Governor) is about 8,000. The Democratic majority on the Congressional ticket, is 8,500. In 1838, our majority in the

election of members of Congress, amounted to 6,232, and the election this year shows a democratic gain of about 2,500.

INDIANA.—The official returns from this State show that there were polled in all 117,292 votes, and that Judge Bigger's (Whig) majority is 8,637—186 less than that of Gen. Harrison in 1836. So much for whig "gains" in Indiana.

Ex-Governor Tazewell, of Virginia, who has heretofore opposed the present administration, has lately come out in a letter strongly in favor of Mr. Van Buren. He says,—"You may appreciate as you please the sentiment I have often uttered, and will therefore again repeat, that, in my judgment, Gen. Harrison is both physically and intellectually incompetent to perform the many varied, arduous and important duties which must devolve upon every President of the United States." Speaking of Mr. Van Buren he says: "I have not been able to detect a single unconstitutional act that has been done or proposed by him during his administration. This is not a slight merit at least in my eyes; and when I connect with it that the whole scheme of his policy, in regard to all our relations, whether foreign or domestic, has evinced much sagacity, prudence and forbearance, and this too, under circumstances of great difficulty, I cannot withhold my approbation from such a course."

At a company parade in Pike township, in this county, on the 4th inst. a vote was taken to ascertain the political complexion of the company, when it appeared that there were—

For Martin Van Buren 88

" Wm. H. Harrison, 8

At a parade in Feesburg in this county there were—

For Van Buren, 98

" Harrison, 16

The State of Pennsylvania, has issued proposals for a loan of \$1,150,000, bearing 5 per cent. interest, redeemable in thirty years. The legislature, at their last session, passed a law levying additional taxes to pay what she already owes.

From the Cincinnati Advertiser.

"THE VINDICTIVE DEMAGOGUE."

No title was ever more appropriately conferred upon any man in this world, than the above upon Henry Clay, by the late Charles Hammond. His every public movement, for the last fifteen years proves the fact; and never was there a more merited rebuke cast upon any demagogue, than is contained in the following letter from the venerable and venerated sage of the Hermitage. It will be read by every honest man in the community, with extreme pleasure and satisfaction. Short and pithy, as it is, the dastard heart of the vile calumniator, must quail under the well deserved reprehension.

Clay has been burlesqued under the title of Prime Hal, but he assumes the character of the boon companion of that prince Jack Falstaff, much more to the life he is, the Prince of Liars.

To the Editor of the Nashville Union.

SIR: Being informed that the Hon. Henry Clay of Kentucky, in his public speech at Nashville yesterday, alleged that I had appointed the Hon. Edward Livingston Secretary of State when he was a defaulter and knowing him to be one; I feel that I am justified in declaring the charge to be false. It is known to all the country that the nominations made by the President to the Senate are referred to appropriate committees of that body, whose duty it is to inquire into the character of the nominees, and that if there is any evidence of default, or any disqualifying circumstance existing against them, a rejection of the nomination follows. Mr. Livingston was a member of the Senate from the State of Louisiana when he was nominated by me. Can Mr. Clay say that he opposed the confirmation of his nomination, because he was a defaulter? If so, the journals of the Senate will answer. But his confirmation by the Senate is conclusive proof that no such objection, if made, was sustained, and I am satisfied that such a charge against him could not have been substantiated.

I am also informed that Mr. Clay charged me with appointing Samuel Swartwout collector of the port of New York, knowing that he had been an associate of Aaron Burr. To this charge it is proper to say that I knew of Mr. Swartwout's connection with Aaron Burr, precisely as I did that of Mr. Clay himself, who if the history of the times did not do him great injustice was far from avoiding an association with Burr when he was